United Nations S/PV.5187

Security Council
Sixtieth year

Provisional

5187th meeting
Thursday, 26 May 2005, 10 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Møller/Ms. Løj	(Denmark)
Members:	Algeria	Mr. Baali
	Argentina	Mr. Mayoral
	Benin	Mr. Zinsou
	Brazil	Mr. Valle
	China	Mr. Zhang Yishan
	France	Mr. De La Sablière
	Greece	Mr. Vassilakis
	Japan	Mr. Oshima
	Philippines	Mr. Baja
	Romania	Mr. Motoc
	Russian Federation	Mr. Dolgov
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Emyr Jones Parry
	United Republic of Tanzania	Mr. Manongi
	United States of America	Mrs. Patterson

Agenda

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Letter dated 16 May 2005 from the Permanent Representative of Denmark to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2005/316)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

05-36082 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Post-conflict peacebuilding

Letter dated 16 May 2005 from the Permanent Representative of Denmark to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2005/316)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Australia, Chile, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, Ghana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Morocco, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Republic of Korea, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland and Ukraine in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the representatives of the aforementioned countries took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. James D. Wolfensohn, President of the World Bank, who will participate in this meeting via videolink.

It was so decided.

The President: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2005/316, which contains a letter dated 16 May 2005 from the Permanent Representative of Denmark to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

I would like to open the debate by making a statement in my national capacity as the representative of Denmark.

This open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding offers an opportunity to discuss one of the key challenges that confront us. Peacebuilding is a multidisciplinary task involving many States and institutional actors, as well as many instruments. The diversity of stakeholders is reflected in the speakers invited today and in the wide interest aroused by the debate.

Under the auspices of the President of the General Assembly, discussions are currently taking place on the reform of the United Nations, including the proposal by the Secretary-General to establish a Peacebuilding Commission. Denmark sincerely hopes that those discussions will have a positive outcome.

The primary responsibility of the Security Council is the maintenance of international peace and security. The nexus between security and development and the importance of addressing both when building lasting peace are facts that we constantly need to keep in mind.

Denmark has issued a discussion paper for today's debate, which sets out some of the main challenges we see on the road ahead. I would like to elaborate on a few of them.

The aim of peacebuilding is, first and foremost, to ensure the transition from conflict to peace, development and reconstruction, and to prevent the recurrence of conflict. Efforts in the immediate post-conflict phase have often been too slow. We have already seen that insufficient international efforts in the post-crisis phase can result in a relapse into conflict. This is particularly true in Africa. If the international community is not able to act swiftly, the fragile peace is at risk, leading to a loss of more lives.

Although the United Nations has made progress lately in strengthening its coherence in post-conflict situations, significant challenges remain in the policy, institutional and financial fields.

First, on policy, we need to ensure local ownership of the process of devising and implementing post-conflict peacebuilding strategies so as to make them sustainable. Truly participatory dialogues between the United Nations and local stakeholders need to be developed to reflect the fact that the country

in question and its people carry the main responsibility for their own future. This would also impose a responsibility on local authorities to cooperate with and facilitate access for the international community.

The regional perspective is often underestimated in the attempt to address a particular conflict. The solution is comprehensive strategies that address the specifics of the conflict and, when appropriate, deal with the regional dimensions. Such strategies must also include cross-cutting issues, such as small arms; demobilization, disarmament and the reintegration of former combatants (DDR); the protection of women and children; and the repatriation of refugees and internally displaced persons.

In West Africa, where soldiers of fortune, mercenaries, and sanctions-busters are taking their deadly business from one theatre of conflict to the next, we should focus more on tackling the cross-border issues by, inter alia, aiming for a comprehensive subregional strategy on disarmament, demobilization and reintegration. Otherwise, there is a risk that the new DDR process in Côte d'Ivoire, which involves large cash handouts, will draw opportunistic ex-combatants from neighbouring Liberia and Sierra Leone.

Regional organizations in different parts of the world are taking on greater and greater responsibilities in the area of peacebuilding. This development should be welcomed and encouraged. We have seen the European Union taking responsibility. Now the African Union is taking on a greater role, particularly in the Sudan. It is important to involve the regional organizations and support them in taking a leadership role.

That is exactly what we have been doing, both bilaterally and through the European Union vis-à-vis the African Union (AU). We hope to see substantial contributions to the extended pledging conference for the AU Mission in the Sudan in Addis Ababa today.

Most post-conflict situations have what one might call a rule-of-law vacuum. The United Nations must be able to more effectively help fill this vacuum. A key prerequisite in this regard is building national judicial institutions, strengthening governance and ensuring transitional justice for crimes committed during conflicts. These efforts require both increased technical capacity and political will for reform in post-conflict societies. I commend the Secretary-General's leadership in that field, and would welcome thoughts on creating a focal point for the rule of law.

Secondly, on the institutional set-up, all relevant actors must be brought in. It is hugely important to ensure systematic contributions from United Nations development and humanitarian agencies in the United Nations integrated mission planning process for post-conflict situations under the auspices of the Department for Peacekeeping Operations.

We must make better use of the knowledge and experience already accumulated by the United Nations country teams. To this end, a system of recording and disseminating best practices should be devised.

The objective of coordination at Headquarters level and in the field is to ensure the best possible outcome through efficient use of available donor resources with no duplication of effort.

That leads me to my final point, on funding. All efforts at keeping and building the peace will come to naught if we are not ready to provide the operations with a sound financial basis. Failure to reintegrate demobilized and disarmed combatants and to provide them with an alternative livelihood is one of the most frequent causes of resumed conflict. Training, job creation and other measures aimed at general growth in post-conflict situations must be subject to much closer cooperation with the international financial institutions and the United Nations funds and programmes. We further believe that at least the initial costs of planning repatriation and reintegration should also be funded through assessed contributions.

The mandate of the recently approved United Nations operation in the Sudan serves as a perfect example of a well-integrated mission, where peacebuilding activities such as security sector reform, DDR, the rule of law and governance are given equal weight with military aspects such as ceasefire monitoring and separation of forces. It is, however, of key importance that the international community be ready to provide the funding pledged at the donor conference on 11 April in Oslo to initiate the implementation of these activities, particularly in southern Sudan. Otherwise the North-South Agreement may start to unravel.

To sum up, we need to develop peacebuilding strategies that, first, aim for local ownership and regional engagement; secondly, are coordinated

between all actors in the field and at the Headquarters level and that make efficient use of the available resources within and outside the United Nations; and, thirdly, ensure sufficient financial means and long-term donor commitment.

I hope that our debate may serve to further strengthen the substantive case for establishing a Peacebuilding Commission at the September summit.

I now resume my responsibility as President of the Council.

I give the floor to the Deputy Secretary-General.

The Deputy Secretary-General: It is almost a year since United Nations troops arrived in Haiti. The Council sent them there to ensure a secure environment after civil violence erupted in the country. Armed gangs were roaming the streets. Police had abandoned their stations. Civilians had fled in fear of their lives. The combination of violence and floods had caused a near collapse of Haiti's already impoverished health and education systems. Three people in five could not get basic medical care.

The tragedy that unfolded last year in Haiti was bad enough. But it was made worse by the fact that we were witnessing history repeat itself. For this was the second time in 10 years that United Nations troops had been sent to Haiti to establish security in the country.

The unfortunate truth is that Haiti is not an anomaly. On the contrary, roughly half of all wars that come to an end relapse into violence. An organization such as ours, set up to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, must improve that record.

It is worth stressing, as the report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (A/59/565) noted, that the surge in mediation, peacekeeping and humanitarian operations that followed the end of the cold war has helped to reduce the number of wars worldwide by almost 40 per cent. Indeed, more wars have been ended through mediation in the past 14 years than in the previous 200. Those are major accomplishments.

But our strategies for ending war must also tackle the question of relapse. We must ensure that peace agreements are implemented in a sustainable manner. We must make sure that critical stabilization activities, such as the reintegration and rehabilitation of demobilized combatants, are adequately financed and carefully implemented. We must help societies and markets recover their vitality. And we must strengthen the capacity of State and social institutions to provide security and justice based on the rule of law, an area where the United Nations can make a real difference and on which the Secretary-General is taking steps to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations system to provide rule of law assistance.

If we are to improve our peacebuilding success rate, four things are vital. First, we must make sure that we build on existing national institutions and capacities, both of the State and of civil society. National ownership is a vital foundation for sustainable peace and development.

Secondly, especially in our operations on the ground, the United Nations system must function in a coherent fashion. So too must its principal organs. In recent years, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council have each extended the scope of their activities in post-conflict situations. Both have critical roles to play.

Thirdly, the international financial institutions, bilateral donors and regional actors must all be involved in United Nations peacebuilding efforts. Their contributions are vital if post-conflict recovery is to be resilient and if the right foundation is to be laid for sustained economic recovery and political stability. That is why I am very glad that the Council had decided to invite Mr. James Wolfensohn, President of the World Bank, to join this meeting today.

Fourthly, both immediate needs and medium-term recovery require more resources. In the early post-conflict phase, funding for national institution-building, including rule of law programmes, is often inadequate. Financing for rehabilitation is unpredictable. And after the first two or three years, just as societies are beginning to develop the capacity to absorb resources and make the most use of them, financing tends to decline. These funding gaps are penny-wise and pound-foolish. When we do not invest adequately in peacebuilding, we find ourselves paying much more for renewed peacekeeping efforts down the line.

In his report "In larger freedom" (A/59/2005), the Secretary-General has proposed the establishment of a Peacebuilding Commission, together with a Peacebuilding Support Office, to help meet these needs. The Commission would fill a gap within the

machinery of the United Nations, and would focus attention on the vital task of peacebuilding. By bringing together the international financial institutions, bilateral donors and regional actors, it would harmonize peacebuilding activity across the multilateral system.

Peacebuilding is one of the most direct and vital contributions that the United Nations makes to freeing people from fear and want and enabling them to live lives in larger freedom. We have had important peacebuilding successes, but we have also seen too many failures. We must implement the lessons of the past and equip ourselves to create the conditions for long-term peace in societies emerging from conflict. And of course, we must also pay more attention to prevention so that societies can address their tensions and problems in ways that will avoid the descent into armed conflict in the first place.

I therefore welcome this debate on peacebuilding and hope it takes us a step further towards freeing more people from the deadly cycle of civil violence.

The President: I thank the Deputy Secretary-General for her statement.

In accordance with the understanding reached among Council members, I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than five minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to circulate the text in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

I now give the floor to the representative of New Zealand. On behalf of the Security Council I extend a warm welcome to His Excellency, Mr. Phil Goff, Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand.

Mr. Goff (New Zealand): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for your initiative in organizing this meeting to discuss the challenges involved in peacebuilding. I would also like to also acknowledge the presence of Deputy Secretary-General Louise Fréchette and of Michael Ambühl, State Secretary for Foreign Affairs of Switzerland.

Denmark has asked us today to consider the underlying problems and issues in peacebuilding, including the substantial policy, institutional and financial challenges. The comments that I am making today on behalf of New Zealand are based on our own experience in peacebuilding, particularly in the Pacific region, but also elsewhere, such as in Afghanistan.

First, to be successful, I think that peacebuilding has to be a long-term commitment. Peacebuilding is about creating sustainable social, developmental and governmental structures. Capacity-building and restoration of civil society takes time. That is as true in our Asia-Pacific region as elsewhere. The smaller scale of conflict does not make peacebuilding any less complex. Timor-Leste is a very clear example of the extraordinary range of functions which the United Nations had to undertake, and of the necessity for time to be allowed for local capacity to be developed in order to ensure that the transition was effective, as it has been. In Afghanistan, New Zealand leads a Provincial Reconstruction Team which has proven to be an effective mechanism combining security, development and capacity-building in the community.

I think we need to remember that in more than 50 per cent of conflicts the situation reverts to violence within five years of the peace agreement. Issues behind the conflict need to be dealt with or the conflict will return. If this does not occur, peace will only be sustained for the period of time that external forces remain deployed.

Secondly, peacebuilding requires flexibility. Different kinds of resources need to be committed, ranging from the deployment of military, police, justice and civilian advisers, to provision of aid and support for non-governmental institutions, including with respect to human rights.

Thirdly, sustainable peace depends on economic progress. Successful reintegration of ex-combatants requires sustained development assistance. Opportunities for work and a better life are necessary to draw combatants away from the cycle of conflict. However, I think from experience in the Solomon Islands and Bougainville we would have learned that payment for weapons buy-back can be counter-productive, as can be the concept of monetary compensation as against traditional customary reconciliation approaches. Throwing money at groups often tends to encourage problems, rather than resolving them.

Fourthly, peacebuilding requires cultural sensitivity. Greater ownership and capacity among local actors are needed for solutions to be acceptable, implementable and sustainable. Getting alongside the

community in conflict situations, working with them in their own structures and acknowledging and acting on the validity of their own views is, in our experience, essential. The pace and nature of the peacebuilding process have to be in line with the culture of those concerned and the context within which it takes place. Regional approaches can be very important, as interventions in Bougainville and the Solomon Islands have shown, but adequate funding for regional missions is no less important than it is for international missions.

Fifthly, the role of civil society in peacebuilding needs to be given greater emphasis in policy development. The experience of the Pacific Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands and our experience in Bougainville is that community involvement — for example, through women's groups and church groups — provides an important avenue for the development of local ownership of the solutions. These groups have a critical ability to represent grass-root concerns in any given conflict and to grant legitimacy and "buy-in" as peacebuilding occurs. A further key strength of the intervention in the Solomon Islands, which has turned around from being a failed State to being a stable State, is that it was done not only with the full support of the Solomon Islands Parliament and Government, but also with all of the countries of the Pacific Forum that agreed on this intervention.

What lessons are there here for the United Nations membership and the Security Council in particular? New Zealand's view is that the practice developing in the Security Council of mandating "complex" missions, including policing, legal, human rights, governance and development components, is very positive, and we would encourage the Security Council to continue doing so.

We would also encourage the Security Council, and the United Nations Secretariat, to continue engaging to the fullest extent possible with national and regional neighbours on context-appropriate peacebuilding mechanisms. Peacebuilding strategies must be designed to fit the particular conflicts.

The Security Council should also consider the earliest possible coordination with other actors in the United Nations system so that planning for sustained and long-term peacebuilding can take place. In this context, I would like to put on record New Zealand's strong support for the proposal of a Peacebuilding Commission. A Peacebuilding Commission would provide a much-needed forum for institutional and political coordination between various arms of the United Nations system. It could mobilize existing resources, find new ones and provide much greater strategic coherence than we have now. Critically, it could also serve to deliver high-level political support so that we do not lose sight of those countries which are at risk.

Sustained, long-term commitment, tailored to local circumstances, is essential for successful peacebuilding. Peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development are mutually dependent and need to be addressed together. New Zealand strongly supports the establishment of a Peacebuilding Commission and urges member States to give this proposal their full support.

The President: Mr. James D. Wolfensohn, President of the World Bank, who is unable to be in New York this morning, will be joining us via videolink, and we will now establish this link. I request the technician to connect Mr. Wolfensohn with the Security Council now. This is a novel way of doing things. He is here on the screen now. Welcome, Mr. Wolfensohn. I give you the floor.

Mr. Wolfensohn: I should tell you, Mr. President, that two of our buildings have just been evacuated because of explosions in the transformers, which were to set the scene for me for this meeting. This gives some idea of what post-conflict is like, and it just shows the attention to detail that there is in our institution — that we should create smoke around our building to give a sense of what we are talking about. I have vacated to another building, and I thank you for the invitation to join you.

Let me start by saying that the World Bank — certainly under my incumbency, which will last another five days, and, I strongly believe, under that of my successor, Paul Wolfowitz — is deeply committed to cooperating with the Security Council on the suggestions of the Secretary-General to have a Peacebuilding Commission, with which we would work closely. The reason for this is not just our admiration for the United Nations and for the Secretary-General; it is because all of us here strongly believe that it is essential to change the balance that exists between making peace, in terms of stopping

conflict, and building peace, in terms of the creation of hope and viable States.

All of us in our institution recognize that, at the moment, the weighting is hugely and substantially on the military side, on the intervention side, on the prevention or the concluding of wars, but far too little is spent on winning the war of peace. The numbers are compelling, as I think the Security Council well knows, maybe better than anybody. Military expenditure accounts for $1,000 billion a year, including, sadly, more than $200 billion by developing countries, and that we spend maybe $50 or $60 billion on development assistance. Separate from that, of course, we still have the problems of trade that will be discussed later in the year in the conclusion of the Doha Round.

Thus, from our point of view, the issue of the transition from conflict to that intermediate zone in which we have worked together in so many countries, to the third area to which the Secretary-General has paid such attention, which is the building of peace, we recognize the interdependence between our institution and the various arms of the United Nations. Last night I read the Secretary-General's report of a couple of years ago on the prevention of armed conflict. As I read it, I was reminded again of the closeness of our perceptions of the issues when the Secretary-General pointed out that an effective prevention strategy requires a comprehensive approach and encompasses both short-term and long-term political, diplomatic and economic considerations.

It really is this line of thought that permeates the excellent report "In larger freedom", on issues of want, fear and dignity, in which the Secretary-General pointed again to a precursor to this notion of a Peacebuilding Commission.

To take the mystery out of this, let me say that the way we look at it is as follows. Whether a country is poor and peaceful, or whether, as in at least 50 per cent of cases, a country is poor and in post-conflict, exactly the same considerations prevail as to whether you can bring hope and economic development to those countries. The considerations are always the same. You must have a strengthening of capacity. You must have people in the country who can in fact run the country. In that context, the issue of capacity-building is essential.

Having said that, that particular problem is exacerbated in post-conflict situations because, very often, the people are not there or have been killed or because in-built antagonisms between one side and the other remain. So, putting together that first strand of capacity becomes critically important, and we must deal with that.

The second element, which, again, we often forget, is that you cannot have a viable State unless you have judicial and legal systems that can protect rights. That too becomes very important in post-conflict situations, where rights — whether physical rights, human rights or rights to contract — are very often tremendously weakened in the post-conflict period. But the second issue remains the same: establishing a form of legal order.

The third issue is that of re-establishing some sort of financial framework so that the people in the country can bring about investment, from micro-credit through to financing small- and medium-sized industry or, indeed, attracting outside investment.

The fourth precondition is making sure that you deal with the issue of corruption.

I note those four elements — capacity, legal and judicial systems, financial systems and corruption — because they pervade the reports of the United Nations itself, including the recent report, "In larger freedom" (A/59/2005), as well as being raised in earlier reports of the Secretary-General. It is therefore not surprising that we should come back to the issue of taking a comprehensive approach to development in the post-conflict arena.

For us at the World Bank, it has taken some time to recognize that the issues of post-conflict situations are the same as those of non-post-conflict situations. The same preconditions are needed for growth in all countries. We are not inventing something new for post-conflict situations. The problem is that in post-conflict situations, the capacity needed is much greater because of the after-effects of the conflict.

Of course, we have the additional issue of calming down the causes that may have generated the conflict. That is a fifth dimension we must address in our post-conflict work together. What caused the conflict? Was it inequity? Was it a desire for diamonds? Was it a desire for natural resources? Or was it long-term cultural differences? Whatever it is, it

belongs to the political side, with which the Security Council is so familiar, but it becomes another condition precedent, exacerbating the problem of the post-conflict situation, as compared to normal development considerations.

After that, the issues of country ownership, of a comprehensive approach and of working together — the Council, the Bank and other agencies — to support a strengthened local Government and local ownership, are exactly the same. We must get local ownership. We must try and deal with that. And the issue here, so sadly true, is that the international community's attention span in bringing about longer-term and even medium-term reconstruction disappears when the bombs stop going off and the headlines dissipate because no one is getting killed. It is hard to photograph peacebuilding. It is easy to photograph wars. Peacebuilding does not get headlines. It is a long-term, tough, day-after-day activity.

It is that issue that I hope that the Secretary-General and those on the Peacebuilding Commission will be able to address in their work. My own judgement is that the solution is not rocket science. It is not something that requires doing doctorates in politics or economics. It is common sense. But it is a common sense that our world does not have. Our world does not give longer-term support to the turgid process of building States. That is a problem we face throughout the issue of development and one that I think we need vigorously to address with respect to the post-conflict period.

In conclusion, very simply, I believe that our analysis and the Council's analysis are very similar. We welcome the fact that the Secretary-General has identified the need for a Peacebuilding Commission. We welcome the opportunity to participate with the Security Council, and we think that together, we might be able to get your shareholders and our shareholders at the level of heads of State and, hopefully, at the level of the congresses and Governments to understand that what we are putting to them is not some radical new insight. It is common sense, and the world needs to have some of that if we are going to avoid more wars.

The President: I thank Mr. Wolfensohn for his common sense and his very good statement.

On behalf of the Security Council, I extend a warm welcome to His Excellency Mr. Michael Ambühl, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, and I give him the floor.

Mr. Ambühl (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): I thank you, Mr. President, for giving me this opportunity to present Switzerland's position. At the outset, I commend you for convening today's debate on such an important issue, and I thank you for the stimulating document (S/2005/316, annex) that you have circulated as a basis for discussion.

The Secretary-General's proposal to establish a new United Nations peacebuilding architecture provides an opportunity that must be seized to help bring about three fundamental changes. First, the new architecture must facilitate the convergence of the security, humanitarian and development perspectives. Secondly, the United Nations system must better collate and take advantage of the experiences gained by all United Nations actors at the local, national and international levels. Thirdly, the new architecture must enhance predictability, transparency and accountability in United Nations peacebuilding activities.

Switzerland expressed its views on the Peacebuilding Commission and other institutional matters during the General Assembly's debates on chapters II and IV of the Secretary-General's report entitled "In larger freedom" (A/59/2005). Today I will focus on four strategic and substantive aspects that are especially important to us.

The first concerns the need for a coordinated, multidimensional approach. The process that leads a war-torn society to sustainable recovery is long and complex. Several objectives must be tackled simultaneously: security, humanitarian action, justice and reconciliation, social and economic development, good governance and participation. In order to be able to strive for those various objectives effectively and simultaneously, it is essential that all actors involved share a coordinated strategy.

Improved cooperation both at United Nations agency headquarters and in the field is required. However, there are limits to centralizing the management of operations. While no one disputes the Security Council's role and responsibilities in maintaining peace, the Council should not monopolize control of peacebuilding and reconstruction activities.

My second point concerns the involvement of national and local actors. Their participation is crucial

for the success of peacebuilding activities. However, that involvement is often left up to the goodwill of the international actors. While the international actors may support that idea in principle, they often put it into practice in a limited fashion, merely undertaking consultations or failing to heed that principle completely. It is therefore important to strengthen United Nations capacity to promote national dialogue and to encourage the real involvement of national and local actors.

My third point concerns the need for partnerships with specialized institutions. Partnerships with independent academic institutions, civil society and the private sector are important for drawing on the best possible expertise. Switzerland welcomes the close collaboration of the United Nations with independent institutions, such as the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining, the Geneva Centre for Security Policy, the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, the Harvard Program on Humanitarian Policy and Conflict Research, the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue, and the International Peace Academy. We encourage the Security Council and the Secretariat to further strengthen such partnerships.

As a fourth point, I would like to stress the importance of an approach based on law.

Respect for the law is important for ensuring a sustainable peace process. Tensions may arise between the rule of law and accountability for past crimes, on the one hand, and power-sharing arrangements and reconciliation, on the other. However, we do think that a dialogue between all relevant stakeholders of a peace process can contribute to reducing those inevitable tensions. In that context, we support the Secretary-General's proposal to create a rule of law assistance unit in the Peacebuilding Support Office. The new unit should concentrate its work on coordination. Concrete activities to promote the rule of law are and should remain within the competences of the United Nations agencies working on the ground.

In conclusion, there are institutional and strategic challenges to face. The international community has a unique opportunity this September to create a new advisory body on post-conflict peacebuilding. The Commission will help to solve strategic challenges and to clarify the terminology, concepts and tools used in the context of peacebuilding. It could also provide advice on peacebuilding mandates, facilitate the coordination of actors involved at different stages of a peacebuilding and reconstruction process, and thus help to address an significant shortfall: the lack of policy coherence in peacebuilding and reconstruction.

Mr. Manongi (United Republic of Tanzania): The United Republic of Tanzania wishes to thank you, Sir, for organizing this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. We wish to recognize and appreciate your personal presence and that of Ministers Phil Goff of New Zealand and Mr. Michael Ambühl of Switzerland this morning. We also welcome the videolink contribution of Mr. James Wolfensohn, whose personal commitment to development and poverty eradication is greatly valued in my country.

The reform of the United Nations will not achieve the desired results if it is not accompanied by other measures to reinforce the Organization's capacities. The close interlinkages between security, development and human rights have revealed the imperative of an integrated approach to peacebuilding. It is therefore important that we examine how best we can promote peace and the sustained rule of law in post-conflict societies.

Lasting prevention means altering the conditions that give rise to conflicts. That is the centrepiece of peacebuilding: building peace by building good governance, meeting basic human needs and fostering social harmony. The United Nations has a commendable record in peacemaking and peacekeeping. However, it is weak in the area of peacebuilding, the problem being that, as currently constituted, it lacks an institutional framework to effectively address the challenge of helping countries transit from war to lasting peace.

It is in that regard that we support the recommendation of the Secretary-General to create an intergovernmental Peacebuilding Commission, including a Peacebuilding Support Office, within the Secretariat. We share the view that the Peacebuilding Commission should, among other things, improve planning for sustained recovery in the immediate aftermath of war, focusing on early efforts to establish the necessary institutions. It should also improve coordination of the many post-conflict activities of the United Nations funds, programmes and agencies.

We believe that the advisory and coordinating functions of the Commission should necessarily involve three integrated components: policy

formulation, institutional partnership and resource mobilization. Of those, we wish to emphasize the value of institutional partnership because, even within the United Nations system, the Security Council is just one among the relevant players in peacebuilding efforts. The creation of the Economic and Social Council's Ad Hoc Advisory Group on African Countries Emerging from Conflict attests to that. The Advisory Group is instrumental in linking up the Economic and Social Council and the Security Council in areas of common concern related to peace and development. We are therefore in agreement with the Secretary-General that, in order to combine efficiency with legitimacy, the Peacebuilding Commission should report to the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council in sequence, depending on the phase of the conflict.

Outside the United Nations system, the Organization must work in unison with regional and international actors. The challenge here is how to build an effective partnership between the United Nations system and other actors for a well-coordinated role in peacebuilding. The United Nations partnerships with the African Union and such African subregional organizations as the Economic Community of West African States, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development and the Southern Africa Development Community have been quite exemplary in the areas of peacemaking and peacekeeping. That important collaboration must be extended in the area of post-conflict peacebuilding as well.

Coordinating resource mobilization is crucial because, without adequate resources, the reconstruction of political, economic, social, security, judicial and administrative sectors will not be possible. Currently, peacebuilding activities rely on voluntary contributions. Practical experience indicates that there is a lack of predictability in mobilizing adequate resources for peacebuilding based on voluntary contributions. It is important that a discussion on the divide between assessed contributions to peace operations and voluntary contributions be initiated. That will help to determine the best way of mobilizing adequate resources for peacebuilding activities.

It is in the context of coordinating resource mobilization that we welcome the proposal to establish a standing fund for peacebuilding. Such a fund should play a central role in resource mobilization. It should be not an alternative to international and bilateral donors, but a facilitator for additional resources for peacebuilding. One of its major functions should be to help ensure predictable financing for early recovery activities — an important stopgap measure to overcome delays in disbursement.

In resource mobilization, the standing fund must link up with regional and international financial institutions, particularly the Bretton Woods institutions. It is encouraging to note that the Bretton Woods institutions have become more responsive to the economic needs of the countries that have been disrupted by conflict.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to recognize the special attention that the United Nations is paying to African conflicts. Lastly, we want to thank you, Sir, once again for providing us with this opportunity to participate in this important discussion.

Mr. Mayoral (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): Allow me at the outset to thank you, Sir, for your delegation's initiative of convening this open debate on such a complex and important issue as that of post-conflict peacebuilding. I believe that the participation of those speakers who preceded me, and their statements, are commensurate with the importance that my country attaches to this item and with that which your country, Denmark, also attaches to it.

This is a timely initiative: to give an integrated response to conflicts, a response in which the concept of peacebuilding complements the traditional idea of peacekeeping. The evolution of the concept of peacebuilding reflects the close relationship between that concept and that of conflict prevention. What we have come to call peacebuilding aims both at eradicating the deep root causes of a conflict and at adopting a diverse group of measures intended to prevent the resurgence of the conflict.

What does the Charter mean when it speaks of the need to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of peace? Ultimately, in our view, this refers to peacebuilding.

We see the process of peacebuilding as an effort to internally improve the conditions for peace by strengthening a society's capacity to manage its conflicts without violence. In that context, in our view, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the elements of an appropriate strategy should include the disarmament,

demobilization and reintegration of former combatants; addressing the situation of refugees and displaced persons; the eradication of poverty; the promotion of sustainable development; the protection of human rights; and the strengthening of the rule of law and democratic institutions.

We consider all those fundamental concepts to be indispensable for planning any post-conflict peacebuilding strategy. However, an integrated strategy must take account of the specific characteristics of each country in conflict. No conflict is the same as another; only through deep knowledge of the causes of a conflict will it be possible to formulate a peacebuilding strategy.

I would therefore like to recall that in the Millennium Declaration (General Assembly resolution 55/2) we decided to make the United Nations more effective in maintaining peace and security by giving it the resources and tools it needs for conflict prevention, peaceful resolution of disputes, peacekeeping, post-conflict peacebuilding and reconstruction.

Peacebuilding is a long-term process that requires sustained action by the international community, as well as by all parties involved, donors and troop-contributing countries, with sufficient resources and a common and coordinated political will with respect to their activities in all phases from planning to implementation.

In such peacebuilding processes, the Security Council has the important role of coordinating the work of numerous actors and of avoiding unnecessary duplication, thus optimizing efficiency, especially with respect to regional organizations, international financial organizations and the affected States. In that regard, coordination by the Security Council with the Economic and Social Council in accordance with the provisions of Article 65 of the Charter has a fundamental role to play in the promotion of sustainable development.

With respect to the Secretary-General's report entitled "In larger freedom" (A/59/2005), we believe that it is extremely important to stress the cooperation and coordination that must exist among peacekeeping operations and the funds, specialized agencies and programmes of the United Nations system. Here, we believe that the role of coordinating the work of the various United Nations agencies, played in-country by the Resident Representatives of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) with the objective of avoiding overlapping efforts or resources, must be coordinated with individual countries' policies for poverty eradication and for reaching the Millennium Development Goals. In our view, the guiding principles for such cooperation must be respecting the decisions of Governments, supporting and complementing their initiatives and not acting parallel to them.

The challenge before us is great: we must strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to prevent conflicts, to respond rapidly when a conflict occurs and to provide solutions for the building of a lasting peace. My country strongly supports that process and supports the present initiative.

Mr. De La Sablière (France) (*spoke in French*): I wish at the outset, Mr. President, to say how pleased and honoured we are that you have agreed to come and preside over the work of the Council today, which focuses on post-conflict peacebuilding, a subject to which, as we know, Denmark is firmly committed. We appreciate that commitment.

Later in the debate, the representative of Luxembourg will speak on behalf of the European Union; I support that statement. I wish only to add a few brief comments.

For many years, Members of the United Nations have been concerned about the fate of war-torn countries once peace has been restored with the support of a peacekeeping operation. In the 1990s, in Cambodia and in the Balkans, United Nations missions were already working — in addition to the work carried out by the various agencies — to build the peace that had been restored. Since that time, peacebuilding has become increasingly prominent in our debates. Many ideas have been put forward over the years with a view to refining the concept. Major reports have been written seeking to improve programmes of action in the field. And, indeed, there has been real progress.

To foster further progress, the Secretary-General has proposed the establishment of a Peacebuilding Commission. France fully supports that proposal and hopes that it will become a reality during the September summit.

The theme of peacebuilding brings together many subjects of direct interest to the United Nations. Today, I wish to highlight two specific points.

The first relates to financing. Money not only drives war; it also drives peace. Peacebuilding has a high cost, which is generally spread out over several years. Many approaches have been envisaged to raise the necessary funds. The question of financing from assessed or voluntary contributions is at the centre of our discussion.

France believes that a clear distinction must be drawn between activities that can legitimately claim funding from assessed contributions and those that should be supported by voluntary contributions from Member States. A certain flexibility is necessary in this regard, and radical positions should be avoided. In all cases, funds that have been pledged or assessed must be disbursed expeditiously, because time is of the essence in post-conflict peacebuilding.

The second point I wanted to mention concerns the process of disarmament and reintegration of demobilized soldiers, the traditional DDR programmes that we find regularly in Security Council resolutions. In several cases we see that those programmes have not yet produced the hoped-for results. Beyond the question of financial resources, we can all do better. Coordination between the various agencies responsible for financing and carrying out those programmes could be improved; there must be better coordination among all the actors concerned. Among its many tasks the future Commission will, we hope, be able to facilitate that coordination.

Before I conclude my statement, I would have a couple of comments. We have already heard them here in the Council, and we think perhaps they make good sense.

The international community, on occasions such as today, must reaffirm its duty to help. However, it is also useful to recall that the primary responsibility for peacebuilding lies with the people emerging from the conflict. Sustainable peace, economic development, observance of human rights and social cohesion definitely need international assistance, but the sine qua non for success is that the people and their leaders mobilize and act together to obtain that goal. France will continue to concern itself with, and act for, recovering countries, as it has always done.

Mr. Valle (Brazil): First, let me say that my delegation highly appreciates your presence here today, Mr. President. I thank you very much for convening this timely and important meeting. I join previous speakers in welcoming you and Ministers Phil Goff and Michael Ambühl and Deputy Secretary-General Louise Fréchette, as well as the statement by Mr. Wolfensohn.

Brazil is a traditional supporter of peacebuilding as an integral part of United Nations work, in particular of its peacekeeping operations. President Lula has been vocal in calling international attention to the fact that it is not only wars and terrorism that represent a threat to peace and security; poverty, hunger, infectious diseases, undereducation and underdevelopment are all equally threatening. The latter, in fact, threaten peace in two ways: by themselves and by their role in feeding or refuelling conflict. No set of sound policies can be adopted in our Organization in the absence of concrete advances in peacebuilding.

Due consideration should be given to transitional processes, and hopefully it has now become clear to us all that the international community cannot afford, either morally or financially, to allow countries to relapse into conflict. That is why post-conflict peacebuilding is so crucial. Peace must be made sustainable in the long term.

It is fascinating to note how our discussions in different forums become increasingly intertwined. If, for instance, we achieve the Millennium Development Goals, including the reduction of hunger and poverty, that will undoubtedly contribute to preventing conflict and its resurgence in many countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa or Asia. All these issues, together with the need to reshape the Security Council in a way that better reflects the international realities, will converge in the September summit.

Official assistance to countries fighting poverty and resurfacing from conflict is much needed and must be stepped up. Beyond such assistance, the international community must also work together with the countries hosting peacekeeping operations to enhance their capacity to produce wealth and to generate income and employment.

In that larger context, the exploitation of natural resources is a crucial matter. Lately in this Organization, the concept of building ownership in areas such as security and the rule of law bas been in vogue, and rightly so. It seems to my delegation that we have to be equally devoted to building ownership with regard to the exploitation of natural resources. Countries struggling with intra-State conflict or

emerging from conflict are often rich in natural resources and face difficulties exploiting and managing those resources in the best interest of the people. That dimension should become a major part of peacebuilding efforts. Though it does not strictly fall within the purview of the Council, the Council's active support will certainly be needed.

As we recall the idea that all our discussions on peace and security are intertwined with the development agenda, it is never too much to stress that the international system should reflect the same principles that are domestically applauded. It must be democratic, from an economic standpoint. What we urgently need is a development-oriented international trade system, free of barriers, so that countries emerging from conflict are given fair opportunity to compete, especially in the area of agriculture.

In the more immediate areas of Security Council action, our vision for peacekeeping operations must be expanded to include certain aspects of reconstruction and of the reintegration of ex-combatants. We must increase our interest in and efforts for the development of quick-impact projects that can provide economic occupations, in particular to ex-combatants and, within that group, to the youth and the women. Those measures are either to be taken simultaneously with other peacekeeping activities or should start even before peacekeeping as such, as was the case in Darfur. As you stated in your paper — for which we are thankful, Mr. President — there is no "one size fits all" solution.

Promoting economic occupation is a key element of peacebuilding. But that does not exclusively mean creating jobs in labour-intensive enterprises; it may also be achieved through building capacity for self-employment, small businesses or craftsmanship. I would also like to reiterate, in that context, that special attention should be given to women — not only because of the horrifying crimes committed against them in conflict situations, but also because they are a powerful instrument of change, being the ones primarily able to pass on to their children morals and ethical notions and better practical education, including basic health practices. Assistance, support and capacity-building targeted at women are likely to make for enduring results.

To conclude, I would like to refer to the Secretary-General's report entitled "In larger freedom" (A/59/2005). It has provided the basis for many fundamental changes in the way we deal with crucial matters such as peace, security, poverty, armed threats and human rights from a conceptual as well as from an institutional perspective. It is for us to seize the moment and not shy away from our historical responsibilities.

Brazil believes that the Peacebuilding Commission proposed by the Secretary-General is one of the many important topics in that reform agenda. With adequate balance between the involvement of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council in its composition, as well as in its operation, and with active participation of the country concerned, it will be possible for such a Peacebuilding Commission to achieve meaningful results in a short time. Appropriate coordination among United Nations actors and the involvement of the international financial institutions are equally essential, and we welcome the important remarks just made by Mr. Wolfensohn in this regard. Brazil will work towards this objective and trusts the General Assembly will approve the much-needed reforms for this Organization.

Mr. Baali (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Peacebuilding is a question that transcends the narrow context of peacekeeping, because it is a key factor in ensuring the lasting settlement of conflicts and the return to sustainable peace and stability.

Today peacekeeping operations aim not only to separate the parties to a conflict but also to eliminate those factors that could promote any resumption of hostilities. Measures that are already being taken include disarming troops and militias that are not recognized as legal; collecting the illegal weapons possessed by former combatants; and demobilizing and reintegrating the latter within their societies.

From time to time the Security Council has undertaken to create missions that are as integrated as possible, as demonstrated in the mission to be deployed in the Sudan. That task becomes easier when, as is the case in the Sudan, the parties to a conflict have previously negotiated and accepted a comprehensive agreement containing all of the elements conducive to ensuring peace, development and respect for the rule of law.

Peacebuilding involves the quest for equitable, reliable and credible solutions to the political, economic and social problems that are at the root of a

conflict. That is a long-term undertaking that requires genuine political will at the local and sometimes regional levels as well as significant support from the international community.

The conflicts that our Organization is facing are generally the result of extreme poverty — the perfect breeding ground for fanaticism and violence. Extreme poverty is also conducive to the usurpation of power by force, the absence of democracy and, as a result, a lack of prospects for change, which, in combination with external factors, sometimes leads to a conflagration.

We believe that, in view of the unique character of each situation and of the absence of a mechanism for the formulation of a comprehensive strategy, any peacebuilding strategy should take a wider perspective and move beyond traditional peacekeeping activities to become part of an ongoing United Nations programme designed to rebuild a country and restore or rehabilitate viable and credible political institutions, so to ensure their support by the broadest possible segment of society, the rehabilitation of social structures and the establishment of the foundations for sustainable economic development.

To give this strategy every chance of success and to help the population to take charge of its own future, the United Nations must intensify its efforts to engage in genuinely participatory dialogues with local stakeholders, with a view to promoting power-sharing, consolidating democratic practices and creating the appropriate capacities to address the unique characteristics of every conflict situation. That means also that, when neighbouring countries are involved, they must support the effort.

Furthermore, including post-conflict peacebuilding elements in the mandate of peacekeeping operations should be seen as an operational measure — in other words, a move aimed at supporting the peacekeeping effort and preventing any conflagration or resurgence of the conflict.

We note with concern that funding for peacebuilding has not yet been placed on a solid and reliable footing. The mobilization of adequate financial and technical resources by the international financial institutions, and in particular by the World Bank, should be encouraged and pursued on a regular basis in order to ensure significant support on the part of those institutions for the international community's efforts. The other programmes and agencies of the United Nations system should continue to play an important part in providing expertise and resources while seeking better to coordinate their activities.

While the Security Council has the primary role in the context of operational activities, including in terms of the need for rapid decision-making, we must note that peacebuilding activities cannot be the sole responsibility of the Council. The General Assembly in particular has a crucial role which it must play, as does the Economic and Social Council, which must be brought in whenever the issues involved are related to social and economic development. Such collaboration would not only be consistent with the prerogatives that the Charter accords to each organ; it would also enable a greater number of Member States to contribute, leading to a more rational and effective handling of the issue.

However close such collaboration might become, it cannot — as experience has shown — satisfactorily meet the multiple, simultaneous and diverse challenges facing countries emerging from conflict. An intermediary organ between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council that would work closely with them — an organ created, set up and given a mandate by the General Assembly — could undoubtedly much better address the many dimensions of peacebuilding-related problems than the aforementioned organs have been able to thus far. The Peacebuilding Commission, which what we are dealing with here, is an organ that must be created. The sooner we can agree on its mandate, its composition and its place within the Organization, the better.

We must also note that efforts to coordinate peacebuilding, the mobilization of resources and the strengthening of the capacity of United Nations staff — or, in general terms, the creation of an international and local environment that is favourable to this type of action — are crucial components of any peacebuilding operation.

The regional dimension of peacebuilding calls for the same level of attention. The contribution of regional organizations under Chapter VIII of the Charter is of key importance, for peacebuilding is closely linked to conflict prevention.

In that context, the African Union, which is making an invaluable contribution to the prevention and settlement of conflicts on the continent, must be fully involved in any attempt to stabilize or build peace

in Africa, because its experience, its skills and its knowledge of the local peoples and terrain as well as of the causes of conflict make it more qualified than any other entity to play an effective and useful role.

However, those requirements, however necessary they may be, should not overshadow another equally important imperative — consistent and scrupulous respect for the independence and sovereignty of the States involved in the process, principles that are clearly enshrined in the Charter of our Organization. If those principles are observed, United Nations missions will garner greater support throughout the world, and would gain, through such legitimacy and support, greater credibility and effectiveness.

Mr. Motoc (Romania): Madam President, I would like first to state our satisfaction at seeing the personal involvement of the Foreign Minister in steering this important meeting initiated by Denmark. My delegation welcomes the earlier participation of the Deputy Secretary-General, Ms. Louise Fréchette, and the statements made by World Bank President Mr. James Wolfensohn; the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand, Mr. Phil Goff; and the State Secretary of Switzerland, Mr. Michael Ambühl.

Romania fully associates itself with the statement to be made shortly by Ambassador Hoscheit of Luxembourg on behalf of the European Union, and I will therefore speak more briefly.

We are witnessing a growing perception that traditional conflicts are on a downward trend in the world. At the same time, challenges and threats to peace, security and stability are multiplying, stemming from a range of non-conventional sources, whether related to frail States, severe poverty, organized crime, terrorism or other factors.

Under such circumstances, post-conflict peacebuilding is clearly an immense task, to be shared by actors at the national level and — indispensably — the international community.

On this topic, there are three points that I would like to emphasize — and I must admit here that it would have been difficult to find many others, given the excellent and extremely thorough background paper prepared by the Danish presidency.

First, Romania advocates strong and — as much as possible — integrated peacebuilding efforts from the early post-conflict stages. In this context, "integrated" efforts refers to the need for coordinated responses from the full spectrum of players involved: local ownership, the United Nations and its specialized bodies and agencies, the international financial institutions and regional organizations, as well as bilateral donors and troop-contributing countries.

The Security Council needs comprehensive and strategic advice on the measures to take in order to ensure the effective transition from peacekeeping and peace support to sustainable peace and development, so that it is in a position to perform its full roll with regard to a conflict. In this respect, we welcome the Secretary-General's proposal on the establishment of a Peacebuilding Commission. We trust that that initiative will be endorsed and that it will be implemented in a manner that will allow the future structure to be effective, meaningful and capable of delivering on the objectives set forth and of avoiding overlap and duplication.

Secondly, we believe that we cannot emphasize enough the key role played by regional and subregional organizations in peacebuilding. The mix of assets that regional and subregional organizations possess — targeted expertise, local knowledge and, in many cases, more accessible capabilities — make those organizations partners of choice for the United Nations, including with respect to post-conflict peacebuilding.

In the Council and elsewhere, Romania has constantly promoted cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations. Enhanced cooperation and, where appropriate, coordination and consultation, between the United Nations and regional organizations are particularly important in peacekeeping and peacebuilding. They should be accomplished on the basis of a more integrated approach, and with the aim of maximizing the use of available resources and capabilities, which, if taken in isolation, will always seem scarce but, if considered jointly, are, possibly, more than adequate.

Furthermore, in line with Secretary-General's recommendations from his "In larger freedom" report (A/59/2005), particular attention should be paid to supporting capacity-building by regional and subregional organizations, especially on the African continent, where such efforts are needed and would pay off in terms of more effective cooperation in peacebuilding.

Thirdly, from our experience in the Security Council so far, it is possible to identify a number of "red threads" — key aspects for a successful peacebuilding approach. These have to do with the development of reliable democratic institutions; ensuring respect for the rule of law, justice and human rights; involving and strengthening civil society; and promoting economic and social rehabilitation and reform. Each of those aspects has its own particular merits in kick-starting a healthy post-conflict society. They all eventually apply, irrespective of whether a given post-conflict situation is or is not listed on the Security Council's agenda, the crux of the matter having to do, in our opinion, with the fact that no conflict should be allowed to linger without being addressed in a credible and effective way.

Mrs. Patterson (United States of America): With today's presidential statement, the members of the Security Council will demonstrate a renewed commitment to an improved post-conflict peacebuilding process. The United States welcomes this commitment with energy and enthusiasm. As Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said in February of this year, the United States is working to strengthen international capacities to address conditions in failed, failing and post-conflict States. At the same time, President Bush has charged us with strengthening our national capacity in this area through better coordination of our nation's post-conflict and stabilization efforts. Today's presidential statement will be an important first step towards improving the focus and organization of our peacebuilding efforts, and we appreciate the presence of the Danish Foreign Minister and the efforts of the Danish delegation in raising this significant issue during Denmark's presidency of the Security Council.

Failing or failed States and those emerging from conflict pose great challenges to international security. Without coordinated internal and international peacebuilding efforts, such States can become breeding grounds for terrorism, crime, trafficking in persons and other human catastrophes. The problems in such countries are infectious. They spread to neighbouring regions like a virulent disease, bringing chaos, misery and despair to the lives of millions of innocent civilians.

The United States has demonstrated its commitment to the post-conflict peacebuilding process, and we are working to further strengthen our capacity to contribute to international efforts in this area. A new Office of the State Department will lead, coordinate and institutionalize the United States Government's civilian capacity to prevent and respond to conflict.

The United Nations has long endeavoured to reduce the risk that nations emerging from conflict will fall back into a state of conflict. But, like all Governments and international organizations, the United Nations has enjoyed only limited success. There has been a distinct and counterproductive lack of coordination among United Nations peacekeeping operations, development initiatives, financing initiatives and other key elements of long-term peace and prosperity. For that reason, we welcome the Secretary-General's proposal to create a Peacebuilding Commission to improve the coordination of United Nations systems, policies and country-specific operations from the start of peacekeeping efforts through stabilization and reconstruction to development activities.

There has been a significant amount of discussion about where within the United Nations system the Peacebuilding Commission should reside and how it should function. We see the Peacebuilding Commission as an advisory body that operates on a consensus basis to provide both expertise and a coordination capacity to the principal United Nations bodies. It is vital that such a commission include in its membership both those with the most at stake and those with the most to contribute. Therefore, while the security of a country is on the agenda of the Security Council, the Security Council should be the United Nations body that invokes the Commission's structure, wisdom and capacity. We recognize, however, that the Peacebuilding Commission must extend beyond the Security Council. We agree with the Secretary-General that, once the Council determines that a post-conflict situation no longer requires its oversight, the Commission could so inform other United Nations organs and agencies — which will have participated in the Commission's work from the beginning.

There has also been a significant amount of discussion of how to fund peacebuilding and reconstruction efforts. The United States does not accept the overly simplistic solution of merely increasing assessed contributions to the United Nations. Such an approach is at odds with the budgeting process in the United States and elsewhere. For example, the expenses of demobilization efforts

and the expenses of reintegration are funded from different parts of the United States national budget and therefore require a more refined approach to funding than that of simply increasing assessed contributions. The various aspects of peacebuilding are subject to different laws and different regulatory requirements, and their funding requirements must be analysed on a case-by-case basis. The challenge is for donor countries to make their funding mechanisms more flexible and responsive to the needs of post-conflict countries. As a major donor, my Government is currently working on means to increase the flexibility of our funding response mechanism.

While the United States looks forward to improving its own peacebuilding activities and is encouraged by the Secretary-General's proposal for a United Nations Peacebuilding Commission, we also recognize the critical role that hundreds of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and their dedicated staffs have had — and will continue to have — in the peacebuilding process. We will continue to establish strong partnerships with NGOs, including groups that advocate the rights of women, as well as think-tanks, private foundations, academics and operational experts, so that their collective capacity and knowledge can assist us in improving the lives of those living in regions emerging from conflict.

Finally, peaceful transition cannot succeed without local stakeholders. We at the United Nations should never view our role as paternalistic or didactic. We cannot allow key local groups to be sidelined or marginalized in post-conflict regions. While we on the outside can and must assist, we must remember that the impetus for development must come from within the country or region at issue. Democracy and freedom must come from within. Peace comes from within the spirit of a people seeking to put a dark past behind them.

The United States is the largest contributor to the assessed budget of the United Nations and the largest donor of development assistance, and it has the most generous private donors in the world, supported by a national tax system that encourages philanthropy. We remain committed to providing resources, in a monitored and coordinated manner, to all aspects of the peacebuilding process. We look forward to working with the United Nations, its Member States, regional organizations and local authorities in countries emerging from crisis, to further our mutual goal of seeking stable, democratic Governments in regions that have too long been ruled by oppression and conflict.

Sir Emyr Jones Parry (United Kingdom): Madam President, the presence of your Foreign Minister underlines the importance of this subject. May I thank the Deputy Secretary-General, and also Mr. Wolfensohn for his excellent common sense and the Honourable Phil Goff and Secretary of State Michael Ambühl for their contributions and insights. Of course, I thank all my colleagues for what they have said.

I align myself with the statement to be made later by the representative of Luxembourg on behalf of the European Union.

The international community has had mixed results with its efforts to build peace. Mozambique has been a conspicuous success recently. That country, which until less than ten years ago was torn apart by war, is now one of Africa's fastest growing and most stable economies, and at the same it has reduced poverty by 15 per cent. But Haiti, despite successive peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions and more than $1.5 billion in international aid, is firmly on the agenda of the Security Council, not yet out of the crisis phase.

Why is it that our collective efforts in post-conflict countries do not always produce the result that we want: sustainable peace? What makes the difference between a Mozambique and a Haiti? While each country has unique circumstances that require a differentiated approach, there do seem to us to be general lessons that we can learn.

I would now like to highlight some of the challenges that we think the international community must seriously address if we are to do better at building more lasting peace in the future.

First, we need better strategic priority-setting and planning at the end of the conflict, and indeed when it looks as though the conflict is coming to an end. This is customarily set out in a comprehensive Security Council resolution. Increasingly, these resolutions tackle the range of issues relevant to a comprehensive peace-support operation — what the chair earlier described as the full range of cross-cutting issues. This tendency needs to be encouraged in order to reflect the indissoluble nature of security, development and human rights.

At the moment, realistically, the United Nations often lacks a single strategic plan for operations in a country that has just emerged from conflict. So all those involved, be it the United Nations Development Group, the Executive Committee on Humanitarian Affairs or the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, need to be working on the same set of comprehensive elements. Integrated missions, where all elements of the United Nations work together in a coherent and coordinated way, are still not a sufficient reality.

Secondly, that integrated plan needs to be delivered by one responsible individual. The advantage of the post of a Special Representative of the Secretary-General is that this person should have the authority and resources to deliver all aspects of a peace-support operation, including welding together the work of the specialist agencies and giving strategic direction to a peacekeeping operation. The question is: do Special Representatives have the necessary training and experience to fulfil these roles? Are they recruited in a manner that ensures that we have the best talent available for this vital job? Do they have a clear set of objectives set by the United Nations Headquarters, with desired outcomes to work towards? I fear that the answers to those questions are invariably negative.

Thirdly, we need the right combination of national ownership and international support, as others have already argued. The international community has a moral duty to help States resolve conflict and a strong interest in seeing this succeed. But for peace to be sustainable, it must be owned and driven forward by the people of the country. It is therefore critical that national/transitional Governments and local civil society are involved from the beginning and help set priorities for peacebuilding and reconstruction.

Fourthly, it seems to the United Kingdom that we need better coordination and coherence within the international community. It is inevitable and indeed desirable, that many different international actors take part in peacebuilding, including, often, regional organizations. We therefore need to ensure that there is no wasteful duplication of effort or unhealthy competition on the ground. Instead, the different components need to make concerted, coherent and positive contributions. Hence the strong need for the proposed Peacebuilding Commission to permit all those interested in a given situation to come together, to identify strategy and then to deliver their individual contributions with maximum coherence of effort and minimum gaps and overlaps. And that, of course, leads directly into the role of what a Special Representative of the Secretary-General should be doing in theatre.

Fifthly, we need earlier, adequate and more predictable funding for peacebuilding, as many have already argued. Donor pledges for reconstruction often take six to nine months to arrive. But, as Mr. Wolfensohn reminded us, immediately a conflict has ended, financing is required, inter alia, to pay civil servants, the military, police, teachers, doctors and so on, as cash is invariably short for Governments.

Sixthly, we need to strengthen our collective expertise and human resources. It is much more difficult by definition to mobilize civilian experts. But their contribution is crucial, especially in the critical area of the rule of law, which can be the key to stability in the early phases of peacebuilding. Therefore we need to develop mechanisms to get the right civilian expertise into post-conflict situations much more quickly. The Secretary-General is working on a roster of experts in justice and the rule of law, and the European Union is developing similar rapid civilian deployment capacities, as are many Members States, including the United Kingdom. But these efforts need to be brought together so that we have an inventory of rapidly available capacity which can be launched as soon as they are needed.

Seventh, we need to sustain political will and attention until a country has made the transition to development and sustainable peace. Peacebuilding is a long-term effort; there are no quick fixes. The time horizon for transition is five to ten years, if not more. Yet studies show that post-conflict countries are most vulnerable to a return to conflict three to five years after the end of fighting. That is why, very simply, we have to sustain international attention and funding throughout that period into durable stability.

Lastly, while peacebuilding is crucial, it is only part of the conflict spectrum. Moreover, there is no regular sequence in which conflict ends, peace is re-established and stability ensues. The instruments of peacebuilding and the emphasis on rule of law and human rights can also be directly relevant to pre-conflict situations. Sustained effort is, therefore, necessary throughout the spectrum from potential conflict, to conflict to peacebuilding if we are to have less conflict to resolve.

It is becoming increasingly accepted that a breakdown in rule of law and increasing violations of human rights are reliable indicators of impending conflict. Regimes whose authority is questioned often cut corners on fundamental freedoms. This will generally deepen discontent and hasten conflict. If that is true — and there is a lot of evidence out there today that it is — the United Kingdom believes that it follows that a society underpinned by respect for human rights and the rule of law is essential for any post-conflict society to achieve lasting peace and stability. Fledgling democracies will carry the people with them only if basic freedoms are respected and if the Government is seen to work for the good and the development of all the people.

In conclusion, political will is key to success. It determines how well we react to a given crisis. Does the international community have the determination to resolve a particular conflict and then to make the real effort necessary to build peace in that country? More generally, do we have the willingness to put in place systems and to accept our global responsibilities to tackle the conflict spectrum as a whole and to be prepared to help build peace where necessary?

The summit in September in New York is the opportunity for nations to make it clear that we accept that responsibility to help countries become peaceful, rule-of-law abiding, democratic States, moving towards economic prosperity. The Peacebuilding Commission is a key aspect of that implementation. The challenge for the summit will be for heads of State or Government to make clear that the international community is prepared to accept this responsibility, and therefore to will the means to implement this commitment much more successfully.

Mr. Zinsou (Benin) (*spoke in French*): Madam President, thank you for having organized this open debate on peacebuilding, a topic of great importance with respect to the goals and purposes of the United Nations and, in particular, with respect to the Security Council's primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The question of peacebuilding arises above all in settling crises and internal conflicts and in preventing their resurgence. A review of the international community's contribution to managing post-conflict situations shows that there has been a true learning curve. We see three types of intervention: peacekeeping operations essentially focused on security issues and on opening up access for humanitarian assistance; peacekeeping operations that seek to help establish solid national democratic institutions; and multidimensional interventions based on a recognition of the need to attack the underlying causes of internal conflict, which are often economic and cultural and thus fall within the development field. Those three types of operations reflect an evolution in our Organization's practice, but they are dependent on structural limits relating to compartmentalization of the principal organs of the United Nations, which has led to the perception of interventions as either sequential or separate — in other words, a series of consecutive phases, from stabilization, to increased assistance for reconstruction, to the promotion of sustainable development.

When we talk about such a sequence, we have to think about harmonious transitions to avoid any gaps or relapses. The performance of the international community in this regard has been spotty, because there have been numerous cases of relapse, resurgent violence and renewed conflict. Processes of normalization have stagnated because of a lack of adequate support or an inability to get the next phases under way.

What we clearly see is a lack of harmonious streamlining among peacekeeping operations, humanitarian assistance and economic development assistance. The added value of today's debate, in our view, resides in our arriving at the appropriate conclusions about the limits of a sequential approach and identifying of the challenges posed by an alternative integrated global approach. Such an approach would involve simultaneous interventions and closer cooperation among the principal organs and institutions of the United Nations.

Another prime requisite is increased coordination of the activities of external actors that participate in peacebuilding. The coordinating function can be legitimately discharged by the United Nations in view of its universality and the legitimacy it enjoys. The challenge relates to the Organization's capacity to mobilize other international actors, in particular the funds and programmes and the international financial institutions. These have to be brought to support a comprehensive integrated strategy and to plan their contribution on the basis of a rational distribution of

work based on proven comparative advantage. That is a way of avoiding duplication.

In this connection, the participation of various external actors in defining strategies would ensure their support and their genuine contribution to the implementation of the strategies. The logical consequence of this approach would be for the mandates of peacekeeping operations to be based on such an integrated strategy. The mandates would then become a reference point for structuring the objectives over the short, medium and long term. They could also provide a context of integrated coordination for taking wise advantage of the potential for synergy arising from increased cooperation from actors on the ground.

The adequate financing of and meaningful implementation of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) programmes is an essential component of peacebuilding. These activities should be carried out in such a way as to make the programmes a catalyst for social transformation laying the foundations for lasting stabilization in countries emerging from conflict and in their regions. We should offer ex-combatants, who are often unemployed youth, child soldiers and women victims of abuse a genuine economic alternative to war by giving them the possibility to participate in training programmes, to adopt a peaceful way of life, to earn a daily wage by finding well-paying civilian jobs and to acquire a culture of peace in the service of peace. These activities should be funded by the regular United Nations budget.

When it comes to local ownership of the peacebuilding process, it is important for the activities of the international community and, in particular, those of the United Nations, to strengthen capacity. When the complexity of a conflict is such that trans-border factors are involved, factoring them in can only help us achieve our goals. That is the case with the conflicts in West Africa, where harmful regional phenomena are exacerbated by the extremely mobile nature of problems arising out of the process of regional integration. Such a context urgently requires the adoption of a regional approach and enhanced cooperation with regional and subregional organizations in order to implement actions aimed at remedying the problems created by conflict.

In conclusion, we reaffirm Benin's resolute support for the Secretary-General's proposals with respect to the creation of a Peacebuilding Commission to fill the structural gap existing in the United Nations in regard to the coordination of action to promote international peace and security.

Mr. Baja (Philippines): I wish to thank you, Madam President, and your delegation for organizing this meeting. Peacebuilding is vital issue for the Security Council. The Council's work revolves around peacebuilding activities as countries emerge from conflict and undergo the process of peacebuilding and economic and social reconstruction.

The process of rebuilding and reconstruction following the cessation of conflict is a challenging and daunting task requiring the involvement of many sectors, both domestic and international. A country emerging from conflict needs the involvement of its citizen and every sector of its society. Local stakeholders need to acquire a deep sense of ownership of the peacebuilding process in order to achieve a stable and progressive future for their society.

Post-conflict peacebuilding also requires the active involvement and participation of the international community through a strong partnership among the Member States of the United Nations, the plans, programmes and specialized agencies of the United Nations, international financial institutions and civil society. All must work hand in hand to succeed and rid countries emerging from conflict of the scourge of further violence.

The complex nature of post-conflict peacebuilding requires a comprehensive mechanism that addresses its various facets. In that regard, the Philippines subscribes to three imperatives of all post-conflict peacebuilding activities: policy, strategy and resources — what we call the "PSR" of peacebuilding — which are defined by the complexity of the post-conflict process itself.

First, all post-conflict peacebuilding requires a clear policy or mandate to succeed. A clear policy emanating from the Security Council is necessary before any post-conflict activity is undertaken. That is in line with the Council's mandate under the Charter of the United Nations. A clear mandate from this body is necessary to put a stamp of legitimacy on the action on the ground and to stabilize the whole situation.

Secondly, it is essential to have a clear, coherent and comprehensive strategy that addresses the period

extending from immediately after the cessation of conflict to the implementation of an exit strategy.

Based on the mandate, a clear strategy should be devised to address: first, the period immediately after the cessation of conflict, particularly the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) process; secondly, the more extended period of political, social and economic rehabilitation and reconstruction, including the crucial aspect of coordination and cooperation between and among the various stakeholders within the United Nations system, such as the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly; and thirdly, the exit strategy for the period in which the United Nations-led involvement in post-conflict peacebuilding ends.

The latter should be undertaken only if and when the people have already been equipped with adequate financial and administrative support, as well as the human and technical capacity to enable them and their country to proceed on their own. A premature exit from conflict areas courts a disastrous slide back into conflict.

As well, in designing the second phase of post-conflict peacebuilding — political and socio-economic rehabilitation — the needs and the requirements of the people must be taken on board. Ownership of the plan and the design ensures a more successful post-conflict peacebuilding process.

Thirdly, adequate resources and support from all actors and the various stakeholders are indispensable. Financial resources are necessary to carry out the plans arising from the country's actual needs and requirements. The best of plans and intentions are futile without adequate resources to support them. In that regard, the Philippines is convinced that a voluntary revolving fund should be established for any post-conflict peacebuilding strategy.

Without a clear policy, the legitimacy of the action on the ground will come under scrutiny, potentially leading to more instability. Without a strategy, the whole process of post-conflict peacebuilding will proceed in an ad hoc fashion, with no clear guidance or direction. Without a clear plan, international actors will not be able to adapt their assistance to the political dynamics of the societies they wish to support. And without resources, the best of intentions will come to naught.

Peacekeeping has evolved from the traditional objectives of ceasefire and separation of forces into a complex weaving of elements working together to build peace in the aftermath of wars. The international community can draw lessons from its experience in Timor-Leste, where United Nations missions delivered on their respective mandates. Those missions enjoyed strong and broad support from local, regional and international actors.

The Philippines believes that if the proposed Peacebuilding Commission, which is now the subject of General Assembly debate, is given the right mandate or policy and the appropriate strategy or mechanism to carry out its tasks, and if it is supported by adequate resources and financing, it could very well supply the missing institutional link of a peacebuilding mechanism, which the United Nations system now needs in order to implement the imperatives that I have spoken of today.

Mr. Vassilakis (Greece): Thank you very much, Madam President, and congratulations for taking the initiative of organizing today's debate on post-conflict peacebuilding, an issue of great interest for the United Nations and of paramount importance to many nations in the world. You have been very successful in generating the necessary interest and support. The participation of your Foreign Minister, of Deputy Secretary-General Louise Fréchette and of many other high officials from various countries and international organizations is tangible proof of that. We thank each of them for their participation and insights.

Greece fully aligns itself with the statement to be made by the representative of Luxembourg on behalf of the European Union.

The end of the cold war created many hopes for peace and security. Unfortunately, violent conflicts emerged, threatening the lives of thousands of innocent people, as well as security, in many parts of the world, in particular in Europe and Africa. It soon became clear that the post-conflict rebuilding of war-torn societies is essential to prevent those countries from relapsing into conflict. The international community, especially the United Nations, took early note of that fact and strove to find ways to end that vicious circle.

The concept of peacebuilding arose to bridge the gap between security and sustainable development. Those issues have now become linked. The concept offers an integrated approach for dealing with a whole

range of issues that relate to peace, security and development.

Many peacekeeping operations of the 1990s combined both peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities. The Brahimi report (S/2000/809) offered various recommendations for specific peacebuilding operations, such as the creation of a fund for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration.

There is a growing international consensus on the importance of post-conflict peacebuilding and the need for its consolidation. As we all know, it is a multidimensional process. It aims at the consolidation of peace after the end of hostilities and the reconstruction and development of conflict-torn societies. It is the only way to prevent them from sliding back into violent conflict.

Contemporary conflicts around the world require more effective peacebuilding that would address the root causes of such conflicts, particularly structural, political, sociocultural and economic factors. More specifically, it should integrate the key elements of human security, political stability based on the rule of law and good governance, social reconciliation, and economic reconstruction.

We are convinced that a successful sustainable post-conflict peacebuilding outcome requires the active engagement of local ownership in the reconstruction process. Local actors, such as Governments, non-governmental organizations and civil society, must be involved in the political process and in setting the peacebuilding agenda. That is crucial for long-term and effective results. The capacities of local actors should be strengthened so that they can cope with future violent conflicts, enhance the commitment of local Governments to the process, and increase the presence of a well-organized civil society.

Furthermore, one should not forget local conditions that need to be taken into account in post-conflict peacebuilding agendas. It is essential, however, that effective post-conflict peacebuilding policies integrate institution-building, the rule of law, good governance and transitional justice, as well as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration efforts.

That highly political process needs to be strongly supported by international actors. The United Nations, regional organizations, donors and other international actors can play a crucial role. They contribute to the implementation of peacebuilding policies.

There is a pressing need for better coordination among those international actors. They have to develop more effective strategies in assessing local needs, allocating recourses and defining priorities. Those strategies have to be well designed and correspond to local realities. Most importantly, they have to be long-term, since reconstruction itself is a long-term process. Rapid response is important in humanitarian assistance and human security situations, but long-term commitment is vital to securing development.

Another key factor for successful post-conflict reconstruction is the provision of financial support at an early stage. International actors have established post-conflict peacebuilding funding mechanisms in order to provide financial aid to countries emerging from conflict. However, it should be noted that neither available financial resources nor existing funding mechanisms are adequate to cover reconstruction needs at their starting point. Despite many efforts, there is a lack of sustainable and adequate funding, as well as a need for improved coordination. That requires better targeted, timely and coordinated financial support and the predictability of assistance.

It is our view that closer interaction and coordination between the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council would be beneficial for sustainable long-term peace reconstruction. Likewise, the various departments within the United Nations — the Department of Political Affairs, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs — should find ways to better coordinate their peacebuilding activities. In addition, effective United Nations involvement requires a well-designed role for the resident United Nations coordinator.

In conclusion, Greece believes that post-conflict peacebuilding is a major priority for the United Nations system due to its contribution to international peace and security and its preventive effects on violent conflicts. In that context, Greece, individually and as a member of the European Union, supports the proposal of the Secretary-General for the establishment of a Peacebuilding Commission. The creation of such a body will enrich the peacebuilding agenda of the United Nations and promote world peace, security and development.

Mr. Zhang Yishan (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation thanks the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Denmark for coming here today to preside personally over this meeting and for delivering his statement.

China also thanks Deputy Secretary-General Fréchette and Mr. James Wolfensohn, President of the World Bank, for their respective statements.

Post-conflict peacebuilding is an essential part of the process of restoring genuine peace and stability in countries and regions emerging from conflict. Past experience shows that, even when agreements are signed and ceasefires are in place, countries and regions may yet relapse into conflict or civil violence if post-conflict peacebuilding efforts lag behind. Consequently, lasting peace and stability can elude peoples in conflict regions.

As conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding are interrelated and mutually dependent, post-conflict peacebuilding must be preceded by peacekeeping. A return to violence must be prevented by means of peacebuilding to ensure stability and development in the countries and regions emerging from conflict.

On the specific question of peacebuilding, I should like to emphasize, first, that a comprehensive peacebuilding strategy must be formulated. When offering assistance to a war-torn country emerging from conflict and facing full-scale recovery and reconstruction, the international community should establish a targeted comprehensive strategy based on the specific needs of the country concerned. Since situations vary from country to country, the focus of such a strategy may range from accelerated reform of the security sector and the early commencement of disarmament to the demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants; from the reconstruction of national institutions and the improvement of governance to the protection of civilian interests; and from the re-establishment of the rule of law, the protection of human rights and ending impunity to the development of the economy to eliminate the root causes of conflict. The comprehensive strategy should be designed to stress all related areas in the process of post-conflict peacebuilding and to have a balanced approach.

Secondly, the lead role of the United Nations as the peacebuilding coordinator must be brought into full play. There are often many players nowadays in the field of peacebuilding, reflecting the international community's attention to and involvement in the post-conflict reconstruction of the countries concerned. They should therefore continue to be encouraged. However, given its experience and advantages in human resources and institutional mechanisms, the United Nations should enjoy a more central role in the coordination and collaboration of the specialized agencies, international financial institutions, troop contributors, the donor community and civil society in order to ensure the optimum impact of international assistance. Moreover, coordination between United Nations Headquarters and field missions should be enhanced and better focused in order to avoid overlapping and duplication.

Thirdly, the United Nations should assist the relevant regional and subregional organizations in developing their peacebuilding capacities. As the African continent is host to most United Nations peacekeeping operations, the region should also become a focus of the Organization's post-conflict peacebuilding efforts. The United Nations should not only help the African countries concerned to undertake reconstruction, but also strengthen its logistical, financial and technical support for the regional and subregional organizations of Africa in the light of the particular situation and special needs of the continent with a view to enhancing their overall capacity to provide assistance in the field of peacebuilding.

China supports the Secretary-General's proposal to establish a Peacebuilding Commission, which we believe would contribute significantly to post-conflict peacebuilding efforts, and especially to the achievement of lasting peace and stability in the conflict areas of Africa. We believe that the Commission should mainly be responsible for planning the transition from conflict control to post-conflict peacebuilding and for coordinating international efforts in that field.

We are in favour of creating a peacebuilding support office within the Secretariat that is both compact and effective. China is ready to join other Member States in further studying that issue in depth, so that consensus can be reached at an early date.

China endorses the draft presidential statement prepared by the Danish delegation. China also appreciates the efforts made by the Danish delegation.

Mr. Dolgov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Mr. Minister, we are delighted to welcome you as President of the Security Council. We welcome the participation in this meeting of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of New Zealand and the Secretary of State of Switzerland.

The topic proposed by the delegation of Denmark for our discussion today is directly relevant to the activities of the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole. Experience has shown that the achievement of lasting peace and the resolution of regional conflicts are possible only when based upon a comprehensive approach that combines traditional diplomatic and peacekeeping efforts with the post-conflict peacebuilding of States emerging from crisis. Only in that manner can regional stabilisation and the non-resumption of conflicts be guaranteed.

The Russian Federation agrees with many of the assessments and points that have been put forward concerning that question in the statements by the Deputy Secretary-General, Ms. Fréchette, and the President of the World Bank, Mr. Wolfensohn. United Nations peacekeeping operations are becoming increasingly complex and multidimensional. The growing complexity of problems caused by contemporary conflicts, which often have a dangerous regional dimension and carry socio-economic consequences, requires that we keep focused on the task of improving overall planning and the deployment of multidimensional operations and that we enhance interactions with other international partners in their respective areas of responsibility.

In that context we should note that the experience of United Nations peacekeeping in Haiti, in Timor-Leste, in Africa — in particular in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Liberia and Sierra Leone — and in other conflict areas has shown that there is an intrinsic link between the restoration of peace and the complete socio-economic rehabilitation of countries emerging from conflict.

Wherever the United Nations has been successful, even on a modest scale, that success has been largely due to the close coordination and integration of the military, political, civilian, humanitarian and reconstruction components of operations. That proves, once again, the growing importance of strengthening interaction between the Security Council and the other principal organs of the Organization that are directly concerned with peacebuilding — primarily the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council — as well as the specialized agencies of the United Nations.

Cooperation in the peacekeeping and peacebuilding areas needs to be deepened between the United Nations and the regional and subregional organizations, pursuant to Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. New positive examples of the development of that cooperation, in particular between the United Nations and the African Union in the Sudan, should be vigorously supported.

A comprehensive approach to post-crisis situations requires a seamless continuity in moving from one stage of peacekeeping to another. Political support by the Security Council is of great importance to peacebuilding efforts, particularly at stages when the central implementing role shifts to operational programmes and specialized funds of the United Nations, and to international and regional organizations.

The Russian Federation supports the idea of establishing a Peacebuilding Commission to enhance the coordination and effectiveness of post-conflict assistance to countries emerging from crisis. It is certain that the modalities for the functioning of that body will have to be carefully and collectively worked out, in order for it to be truly effective. The Russian delegation is prepared to engage constructively in that work.

The Russian delegation believes that the official statement of the President of the Security Council — the draft of which was kindly prepared by the Danish delegation for adoption at the end of today's meeting — contains a number of important points the implementation of which by the United Nations system and by its partners should make it possible to strengthen the peacekeeping achievements of the entire Organization and to strengthen stability throughout the world.

Mr. Oshima (Japan): My delegation is very grateful that the Danish delegation has taken the initiative to organize this open debate on post-conflict peacebuilding. We appreciate its participation in the debate and its guidance on this important issue.

One of the priority issues in my country's international assistance policy is its support for the

consolidation of peace and for nation-building in countries emerging from conflict. Japan has long stressed the need for seamless assistance in the comprehensive settlement of conflicts. In particular, my Government believes in the importance of peacebuilding right from the earliest stages of conflict settlement. As a result, Japan has supported peacebuilding activities in Timor-Leste, Afghanistan, Iraq and various conflict areas in Africa.

Speaking from Japan's experience, one challenge we face in conflict resolution and post-conflict peacebuilding efforts is that there is no general template for handling all conflict situations. The same is true regarding the role of the United Nations in that area. For example, the United Nations had administrative control of Timor-Leste during a brief transitional period before independence. During that period, the United Nations was directly in charge of all peacekeeping activities on the island.

The United Nations policy in Afghanistan is called the light footprint approach. There, the United Nations has encouraged local leaders to take charge, while respecting the initiatives of other international participants. In Africa, the United Nations approach to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration issues has differed considerably from one conflict to another, taking into account the nature of each particular conflict as well as the local situation. The role of the United Nations in peacebuilding should be flexibly defined by the specific conflict situation and the roles played by other peacebuilding participants.

Among a number of important issues contained in the discussion paper for this open debate, my delegation would like to address three, namely, local ownership, a comprehensive strategy and integrated approach and, finally, financing.

Ownership by local actors must be encouraged and strengthened as much as possible. Japan fully agrees that self-help efforts by the local population are essential for the success of any peace agreement and should be respected.

In a similar vein, the success of post-conflict peacebuilding depends on having the locals in the driver's seat. The role of international assistance should be to provide support as necessary. There often arise situations, however, where the national Government is either in a state of collapse or not functioning at all. In such a case, it is imperative for the international community to take the lead in peacebuilding until a new Government starts to perform its role effectively.

However, we need to be aware of the risk of making the local aid recipients overdependent on international assistance. Projects aimed at local empowerment and capacity-building would help to prevent that from happening. In addition, peacebuilding projects should make the best possible use of local human resources and local ownership.

National Governments are not the only local partners for us. Even in conflict situations, traditional entities, communities and civil groups can sometimes play critical roles. I would like to recall the debate on the role of civil society in post-conflict peacebuilding that was held last June in this Chamber, when the Security Council praised the important role played by civil society. We should acknowledge the contribution that such groups can make and look for ways to cooperate with them. They are important partners in our peacebuilding activities. That is all the more true when a national Government is not functioning.

You, Mr. President, also raised the need to develop a comprehensive strategy and to integrate the activities of all the relevant actors. Cooperation and coordination among international participants in the peacebuilding process is indispensable to achieving those objectives. We should note that there are different levels of cooperation, depending on who the actors in question are, especially as the concept of integrated missions has been discussed actively at the United Nations of late.

First, within complex peacekeeping operations and peacebuilding missions, the activities of their different components must be adequately integrated, under the leadership of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, for the fulfilment of the mission's mandate.

Secondly, cooperation with United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies is also critically important. The Special Representative should be given authority to ensure effective coordination with these United Nations bodies. In undertaking such coordination, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General should seek to ensure the best possible division of labour, taking into account the areas of responsibility, advantages and degree of

achievement on the ground of each of the United Nations bodies concerned.

Thirdly, outside the United Nations and its related organizations, the World Bank and other international financial institutions play an indispensable role in peacebuilding, and I thank the President of the World Bank, Mr. Wolfensohn, for his elucidating observations delivered via videolink.

We must also acknowledge that international non-governmental organizations and the International Committee of the Red Cross system also play very important roles in peacebuilding. These organizations often begin activities when a conflict is in its early stages. Therefore, they gain deep knowledge and broad experience in dealing with the conflict.

We agree that stable funding is important for peacebuilding. The comprehensive settlement of a conflict is bound to depend on peacebuilding activities continuing for a certain period of time and also requires financial resources. Peacekeeping is financed through assessed contributions and enjoys funding stability. By contrast, peacebuilding is mostly financed through voluntary contributions, which depend on the goodwill of donors. Simply turning to assessed contributions, however, is not a solution. If we financed all peacebuilding activities through assessed contributions, it would hinder not only the optimum allocation of financial resources but also local ownership in peacebuilding. It could also risk expanding and prolonging United Nations engagement beyond what is actually necessary. Therefore, we should discuss which types of peacebuilding activities should be financed through assessed contributions and which should be financed through voluntary contributions. This needs to be done on a case-by-case basis, based on existing divisions between the two in terms of scope, while taking into account the nature of individual conflicts and the situation on the ground. We should also consider mobilizing the private sector in the financing of peacebuilding efforts.

Before closing, let me raise the issue of the relationship between peacebuilding and human security. Japan has advocated consistently the idea of human security, which deals with threats from not only the point of view of State security but also from the human perspective. Its objective is to protect people from critical and pervasive threats to human life and to their livelihood and dignity and thus to enhance human fulfilment. Human security thus understood provides an important perspective for peacebuilding.

As stated in the report of the Commission on Human Security, which takes up the transition from conflict to peace as a priority issue, the response from the international community should take into full account the needs of people on the ground and of the local community. The success of peacebuilding and the transition from conflict to peace and development hinges on whether the idea of human security can be translated into reality, so that people are protected and empowered to stand on their own two feet.

In conclusion, the idea of a Peacebuilding Commission, as proposed by the Secretary-General, has Japan's strong support. My Government has made proposals in General Assembly discussions on how such a body might be set up and what its functions should be to ensure its effectiveness. We will spare no effort in working with other interested countries to ensure that a Peacebuilding Commission is established and can begin its work soon. That is the best way to address the important issue we are discussing today in concrete terms.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Luxembourg, to whom I give the floor.

Mr. Hoscheit (Luxembourg) (*spoke in French*): Mr. President, your presence at today's debate, convened in such a timely manner by the Danish presidency of the Security Council, stresses the importance that we must attach to the subject that we are discussing today.

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania, the candidate countries Turkey and Croatia, countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Serbia and Montenegro, as well as Ukraine, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union fully recognizes the need to bridge the gap in United Nations machinery that exists between the end of armed conflict and the resumption of sustainable development through post-conflict peacebuilding. Experience has shown that peacebuilding activities are crucial to ensuring that countries emerging from war avoid any relapse into

violence and conflict by assisting them in their transition to lasting peace and long-term development.

Post-conflict scenarios are complex situations calling for a comprehensive and coherent strategy involving a variety of different needs, actors and tools as well as a broad spectrum of activities such as the protection of civilians, disarmament, demobilization, the reintegration of combatants, security sector reform, reconciliation, the rebuilding of institutions and of basic infrastructures, as well as timely support for sustainable social and economic development, the establishment of effective and democratic governance, respect for the rule of law and human rights, and the full and equal participation of women, in accordance with resolution 1325 (2000).

While outside assistance can be indispensable in creating a secure environment, national ownership allowing for an early involvement, including at the planning stage, of actors at the local and national levels in post-conflict peacebuilding activities and their accountability for long-term development is equally indispensable. That will help ensure the sustainability of both the security environment and of subsequent peacebuilding activities. International efforts to foster ownership must build on local potential by using existing resources as early as possible in the process.

To avoid any relapse caused by cross-border interference, regional problems need regional solutions as well as policies based on a regional perspective. West Africa is probably the most telling example in that context. Regional and subregional organizations must participate in peacebuilding activities at the earliest possible stage.

One challenge related to peacebuilding is effectively to bring together the various actors, instruments and capabilities based on their comparative advantages. From the outset, special attention should be given to avoid any duplication between the activities carried out by integrated peacekeeping operations and those falling under the purview of United Nations specialized agencies and programmes, as well as to the early involvement of the international financial institutions. A further deepening of the dialogue and practical cooperation between the United Nations and other international or regional organizations, including during the mission-planning phase, is also needed.

The European Union, for its part, has used its development policy and other cooperation programmes to provide a basis for post-conflict reconstruction activities. These constitute powerful instruments for addressing the root causes of conflict and thus preventing their re-emergence. The European Union, which provides some 55 per cent of development assistance, 66 per cent of grant assistance and around 55 per cent of humanitarian assistance worldwide, must play — and is, indeed, playing — a lead role in addressing post-conflict challenges.

The European Union is also striving to consolidate post-conflict reconstruction processes worldwide — often in close cooperation with the United Nations or by supporting United Nations operations — through a range of activities, including institution-building, the rehabilitation of basic infrastructure, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration activities (DDR) and security sector reform, as well as through support for reconciliation and regional integration processes, human rights and democratization activities. But we can, and must, improve our focus and the effectiveness of our actions. We must be able to respond rapidly to specific situations and adapt our response to the particular circumstances, using the appropriate mix of instruments. In every situation there is a risk that the international community will assist only partly in the process. Ongoing assistance must be guaranteed, particularly with regard to DDR programmes.

In the area of civilian crisis management, the European Union is active in a number of priority areas. These include police training, since civilian police have an important role to play in post-conflict environments, promotion of the rule of law, strengthening civilian administration, civil protection and security sector reinforcement. Five operations, involving the mobilization of 1,300 personnel on the ground, are currently under way: police training missions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and in two areas in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and a rule-of-law mission in Georgia. An integrated rule-of-law mission for Iraq will be launched in July 2005, through which some 770 people will be trained.

In order to address immediate needs, the European Union will need to further develop its capacity to deploy multifunctional civilian crisis-management resources in an integrated format and at

short notice for use in the context of European Union-led autonomous missions or of operations conducted by other organizations, such as the United Nations or the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. A European Union rapid civilian-response capability could contribute added value to international peacebuilding efforts.

The European Union intends to develop its capacity to work more with the United Nations so as to assist countries emerging from conflict and will accordingly endeavour to link emergency relief, rehabilitation and development. We are also firmly committed to developing our cooperation with the African Union and subregional organizations. The European Union action plan in support of peace and security in Africa focuses on a number of practical actions that are largely oriented towards peacebuilding. In that context, the European Union will today submit to the pledging conference in Addis Ababa a comprehensive and substantial offer of support to assist the African Union's efforts in Darfur.

In order to bridge the gap between the end of an armed conflict and the achievement of sustainable development, and to ensure the formulation of a comprehensive and coherent strategy for peacebuilding in specific post-conflict situations, we need an institutional mechanism that involves all relevant actors. In this context, the European Union welcomes the Secretary-General's proposal to establish a Peacebuilding Commission and endorses the main purposes and functions set out in his explanatory note. The European Union also recognizes the importance of sustained, assured and predictable funding for peacebuilding activities.

Mr. Sen (India): We are appreciative of the fact that you, Sir, are personally presiding over this meeting. We also congratulate Denmark on its exemplary handling of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of May.

We welcome this opportunity to participate in this debate to discuss the current policy and institutional and financial challenges in post-conflict peacebuilding without duplicating the General Assembly's deliberations on the possible modalities of a Peacebuilding Commission. In order to keep to the time scheduled, I will confine myself to essential points. Any consideration of the issue in the context of the role of the United Nations in post-conflict peacebuilding today cannot realistically be divorced from the proposal of the Secretary-General.

India's approach towards post-conflict peacebuilding is determined by its role as a major troop contributor to United Nations peacekeeping operations and as an emerging non-traditional donor for reconstruction activities. As such, India has a keen interest in the issue, as it does in ensuring that the concept and implementation of a Peacebuilding Commission are well-defined from the very inception of the process.

We believe that the main functions of the proposed Peacebuilding Commission should be to ensure greater coordination between the international community and donor countries on the one hand, and national authorities on the other; to promote a sense of ownership among national authorities for the policies and programmes that are supported by the international community and donor countries; and to provide assured funding for the activities that are agreed upon as priorities by the national authorities and the international community.

Regarding its functions, in our view the Secretary-General's decision to restrict the scope of the Peacebuilding Commission's work to post-conflict peacebuilding, as opposed to the wider mandate, beginning with structural prevention, proposed by the High-level Panel, is rational and pragmatic. The main advantages of a narrower, better defined area of activity are that it would allow the Peacebuilding Commission to concentrate its resources, both personal and financial, in an optimal way. We also agree with the Secretary-General that the Peacebuilding Commission should not have an early-warning or monitoring function.

The proposal relating to core membership of the Peacebuilding Commission is not clear in terms of the proportion of representatives from the various interest groups — the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, donors, troop contributors — identified by the Secretary-General. Moreover, it is implicit, though not explicit, that members will be individuals nominated by their respective Governments — as in the case of the Commissioners of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission, for example. No mechanism to determine the chairpersons of the core bodies or country-specific meetings has been specified.

The institutional structure of the Peacebuilding Commission needs to be defined clearly. The Secretary-General has proposed that the Peacebuilding Commission advise the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council in sequence, depending on the state of recovery. While this is functionally tenable, it does not take into account the fact that that important body would be answerable only to organizations with a select membership, not to the general membership. It is essential that the Peacebuilding Commission be made accountable to the General Assembly. That can be done without prejudice to its normal functioning, through periodic reports in which it must seek the guidance and approval of the General Assembly on policy issues.

Criteria on the basis of which a particular country under the Peacebuilding Commission would move from the Security Council to the Economic and Social Council need to be formulated. For example, the transition could begin from the time the Council starts a review of the force size of a peacekeeping mission. Ideally, the General Assembly could decide the transition through a review. It is somewhat unrealistic to set the transition from the Security Council to the Economic and Social Council only after the situation in a country is no longer on the agenda of the Security Council, as a country remains at times on the agenda of the Security Council for several years before it is removed on a no-objection basis.

We await the outcome of the Secretary-General's consultations on the participation of international financial institutions. Time and again, the best intentions and programmes for peacebuilding have been undermined by a lack of funds. The programmes are often based on commitments made by donor countries that do not translate into actual cash. The Standing Fund for Peacebuilding potentially offers a solution. The mechanism for sustainability of the Standing Fund and accountability for the contributions made to it need to be outlined carefully and agreed upon. It is, however, not clear whether the Standing Fund for Peacebuilding is solely meant to cover the gaps in funding, or would become the regular source for financing peacebuilding projects.

It is important to highlight the role of the proposed Commission in the context of proposing overall priorities, and to ensure that those priorities reflect country-based realities and to avoid repeating and reinforcing the existing paradigm of externally formulating policies and programmes for countries transitioning from conflict to post-conflict peacebuilding. The country-based realities component is perhaps the most important aspect of setting priority goals in order to avoid the same sequence in structure. The international community is setting goals which cannot be implemented, owing to a lack of understanding of the realities on the ground. It is therefore important to utilize the expertise of national authorities, in whatever nascent form it is available, to set priorities that the international community can support. In some cases, those priorities also have to be appropriately modified. That should be perceived as an essential part of the process of capacity-building as well.

The Peacebuilding Commission is required to perform the vital role of ensuring system-wide coherence. Any peacebuilding effort involves a number of actors, including representatives of the United Nations system, bilateral donors, troop contributors, regional organizations, international financial institutions and the like. However, in any post-conflict situation, there are a very large number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and relief agencies involved as well. One of the main drawbacks cited in post-conflict peacebuilding situations is the lack of coordination among the plethora of NGOs that compete for scarce resources, inevitably overlap in areas of activity and divert local assets, such as interpreters, trained personnel, etc., for their own projects, sometimes by paying extravagant sums, thus driving up the market rents and salaries. Perhaps the Commission should be mandated to attempt to provide a systemic coherence to all such post-conflict peacebuilding activities.

I have confined my statement to a few suggestions on the concept of a Peacebuilding Commission in the United Nations. Undoubtedly, this issue will be discussed at some length at the General Assembly, where different views on the modalities of the proposal will be aired. However, there is little doubt that the Secretary-General's proposal has sought to fill what he has described as "a gaping hole in the United Nations institutional machinery". There is also little doubt about the imperative need for and utility of such a body. India is fully supportive of the proposal and will be happy to engage constructively in discussions in the General Assembly on its establishment.

The President: I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.

Mr. Dauth (Australia): I know we must be brief and thus must dispense with the courtesies, but it would be very wrong of me not to congratulate Denmark on its outstanding handling of the Council's work this month. It is typical of the wonderful work which my friend and colleague, Ambassador Løj, does here.

As the current debate recognizes, post-conflict peacebuilding is a crucial challenge facing the international community and entirely properly a focus of Security Council attention. Peacekeeping is often the prime focus of the Council's deliberations, but it represents only the start of a longer-term progress towards peace, stability and prosperity in conflict-affected areas. As history and bitter experience show us, even the best peacekeeping efforts can come to naught if post-conflict peacebuilding is neglected. In that regard, Australia has warmly welcomed the recent successful end to United Nations peacekeeping in Timor-Leste and the creation of a successor mission with a strong peacebuilding mandate.

It is important to remember, however, that peacekeeping and peacebuilding are not necessarily the endpoints of a linear process — they are interlinked, interwoven and, at times, interdependent. Planning for peacekeeping must recognize that peacebuilding often needs to start before peacekeeping ends. Clearly, peacebuilding is not easy. Indeed, building peace — including strengthening State institutions, re-establishing law and order and creating prosperity — can often be more difficult than ending the war.

Peacebuilding must be a multifaceted and comprehensive exercise across the full scope of development, security and human rights — I mention human rights very deliberately — reflecting the interconnected nature of issues and the complex challenges facing post-conflict societies. It must also place strong emphasis on developing local capacity and encouraging ownership of peacebuilding activities. Others have spoken of this. In that regard, partnership and close consultation with affected communities and the early delivery of a peace dividend to consolidate ongoing community support are vital.

Security sector reform, encompassing police, corrections and judiciary, is an important element of peacebuilding and can often be the key prerequisite for rebuilding shattered economies and restoring social services. To be effective, however, peacebuilding must also address longer-term economic and social development issues. Peacebuilding must be able to determine and address the sources of conflict, be they poor access to government services, a breakdown in traditional authority structures or uneven economic opportunities, which are the factors that underline that good governance and soundly based economic policies are important components of peacebuilding.

Regional peacebuilding is a vital complement to the work of the United Nations. In our own region, initiatives such as the Regional Assistance Mission to the Solomon Islands (RAMSI) provide valuable examples of how peacebuilding works in practice. Initiated in July 2003 as a common Pacific Islands Forum response to a direct request for assistance from the Solomon Islands, RAMSI has enjoyed remarkable success and benefited from direct contributions of personnel from some 11 regional nations to date. The Solomon Islands' call for assistance posed a key peacebuilding test that the nations of our region, under the framework of the Forum's Biketawa Declaration, met with collective resolve. The RAMSI experience has also highlighted the value of taking an integrated and sequenced approach to peacebuilding, coordinated between all security and development actors and in close collaboration with the affected country.

Not least, given our experiences in our own region, Australia welcomes the current proposal for a Peacebuilding Commission and believes that close coordination between the Commission and the Security Council would be vital to ensure that the United Nations is well placed to assist post-conflict societies. The creation of a Peacebuilding Commission would also offer the opportunity to coordinate and foster a far more effective international response capability and would enhance the integrated mission planning process. In addition to post-conflict peacebuilding, prevention of conflict remains an important objective, and we should continue to do our utmost to strengthen the United Nations conflict prevention and mediation capacities, including through the Security Council and the good offices role of the Secretary-General.

The President: I thank the representative of Australia for his kind words to the presidency.

There are still a number of speakers remaining on my list for this meeting. I intend, with the concurrence of members of the Council, to suspend the meeting until 3 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 1.10 p.m.